



Patent  
Attorney's Docket No. 1000409-000078

EFW

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of )  
Genta Moriyama et al. ) Group Art Unit: 3636  
Application No.: 10/739,148 ) Examiner: ERIKA P GARRETT  
Filed: December 19, 2003 ) Confirmation No.: 2535  
For: SEAT ASSEMBLY FOR VEHICLE )  
)

## DISCUSSION OF SUBSTANCE OF EXAMINER INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Set forth below is a discussion of the substance of an interview conducted at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office with Examiner Garrett and Examiner Dunn on August 21, 2007, and subsequent discussions with Examiner Garrett.

During the interview at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, the undersigned generally discussed the vehicle seat assembly recited in independent Claims 2 and 12, noting that the claimed seat assembly comprises, in combination with the other claimed features, a first drive unit for moving the seat cushion and a second drive unit for moving the seatback. As explained during the interview, the Kuo reference discloses several motors, but only the single motor drive 88 moves the seat cushion and the seatback. Examiner Garrett explained that the operation of motor drive 52 might be said to move seatback and/or seat cushion as the motor drive 52 moves the bench.

To better set forth the distinction that the vehicle seat assembly here includes a first drive unit that moves the seat cushion and a second drive unit that moves the seatback, the undersigned and the Examiners discussed amending Claims 2 and 12

to recite that the first drive unit moves the seat cushion "into the stowed position."

The Examiners indicated that this language would overcome the prior art rejection and place Claims 2 and 12 in condition for allowance. During the interview, the undersigned also mentioned that applicants were considering canceling Claim 13.

Following the interview, the undersigned authorized Examiner Garrett to make the above-discussed changes to Claims 2 and 12 by way of an Examiner's Amendment. In addition, in light of the allowability of dependent Claim 19, the undersigned authorized Garrett to amend Claim 13 to include the subject matter recited in Claim 19, rather than cancel Claim 13. The undersigned also authorized Examiner Garrett to cancel Claims 24 and 25 to negate the issue raised in paragraph "2" of the Official Action and to cancel Claim 19. Finally, the undersigned authorized Examiner Garrett to change the dependency of Claim 20 so that it depends upon Claim 13.

Should any questions arise concerning this matter, the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: October 2, 2007

By:

  
Matthew L. Schneider  
Registration No. 32814

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620